1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Alexandria Division -----: NETSCAPE COMMUNICATIONS CORP., : Plaintiff, : Case No. 1:09-cv-225 -vs-Defendants. VALUECLICK, INC., et al., HEARING ON MOTIONS September 4, 2009 Before: Mag. Judge T. Rawles Jones, Jr. APPEARANCES: Vincent Kovalick, Counsel for Plaintiff Alec W. Farr and Sheila M. Costin, Counsel for the Defendants

3

take any further burden off Mr. Zawinski.

2 Thank you, Your Honor.

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 THE COURT: Mr. Arshad, what's going on here?

4 MR. KOVALICK: Yeah, I think I can probably shed

5 some light on that, Your Honor, because I have been involved

6 with Mr. Zawinski since the time of his deposition. And in

7 | fact, I was the lawyer that requested that rather than

8 opposing their additional discovery, that he give the

9 additional discovery because I told him, you know, after the

10 deposition, I said, you did a search, they found a couple of

11 | terms they would like you to search further. And any judge,

12 any federal judge is going to ask you to do that search. So,

13 there is no point in fighting this now.

And he went through his, my right of privacy and all the reasons that are in his declarations, the fact that there is embarrassing and those types of e-mails in there. He said, look, Vince, I was 25 when we had these communications, there is embarrassing stuff in there, I don't want that out in public. I don't know how it's going to be disseminated and I don't know where it's going. And my hard drive is full of my business records now, I run a business off of my computer in my home in San Francisco, and there is no way I can consent to have people doing that sort of a search.

I said, look, I respect your right of privacy, that's a reasonable position and I am happy to advocate that

```
4
 1
     in front of a federal judge, but you have to agree to do a
 2
     further search.
 3
               So, we asked them for the search. We said, what do
 4
     you want him to do? And that's in, it's in the briefs, it's
 5
     in the declarations.
 6
               THE COURT: Which I have read.
 7
               MR. KOVALICK: Okay.
 8
               THE COURT: And I agree with defendants' counsel
 9
     that he still hasn't run a search for the terms that they
10
     justifiably want run.
11
               MR. KOVALICK: Okay. And all we need then is those
12
    terms because we took the terms they sent us--
13
               THE COURT: Well, maybe all you need-- He has had
14
     the terms. And he hasn't done it.
15
               So, I think what you need is an order from me, which
16
     I am getting ready to give you. And the order is going to say
17
     that he has to search -- Is everybody agreed that we are
18
     dealing with one hard drive here? He still--
19
               MR. KOVALICK: That I don't know, Your Honor.
20
     suspect that's accurate though.
21
               MR. FARR: Your Honor, no, we don't know that.
22
     We've assumed it's one, but it could be more with backup
23
     tapes. We understand he kept all of his Netscape files with
24
    him.
25
               THE COURT: Well, I am going to require that he
```

search his records, defined in the broadest sense, any 1 2 electronic -- I am showing my age here. I still use the term 3 "record." We are talking about ESI. 4 He has to search all of his ESI for all of the terms 5 that defendants have requested be run against all that media. 6 MR. KOVALICK: Okay. 7 THE COURT: And anything that you and he think, it 8 has to be both of you, think is inappropriate to turn over 9 because it's personal in nature or would be embarrassing or is 10 otherwise subject to a Rule 26(c) protective order, you can 11 submit to me in camera. 12 You can tell him that I too remember what it was 13 like to be in my twenties, and I appreciate his concern, but 14 defendants are entitled to defend this case on the facts, and 15 the case is going to be litigated on the relevant facts. 16

MR. KOVALICK: I fully agree. We have not been withholding any--

THE COURT: All right. Well, you explain that to your client however you want to explain it to him.

MR. KOVALICK: Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I would expect that all that can be accomplished before the end of next week so that you can have in my chambers for any in camera review that I need to do anything that's responsive but as to which he wants a Rule 26(c) protective order. And I will deal with it.

```
1
               MR. KOVALICK: Okay. I appreciate that, Your Honor.
 2
               Now, I mean, he has produced documents.
 3
               THE COURT: I understand that.
 4
               MR. KOVALICK: Okay.
 5
               THE COURT: I understand the situation.
 6
               MR. KOVALICK: Okay, very good.
 7
               THE COURT: He has got to run, and at this point I
 8
    mean rerun all those terms against all of his ESI.
 9
               MR. KOVALICK: Very good.
10
               THE COURT: Okay.
11
               MR. KOVALICK: Yes, sir.
12
               THE COURT: All right.
13
               MR. FARR: Your Honor, thank you, that's very
14
    helpful. Could I just seek a couple of clarifications?
15
               THE COURT: Okay.
16
               MR. FARR: Could we resubmit to them, given that I
17
    believe there may have been some confusion or we're not sure
18
     what searches--
19
               THE COURT: I think that's a good idea.
20
               MR. FARR: Let's send them the search terms we want
21
     again. I understand Your Honor is not going to order the
22
     inspection. If we resend, at this point if we resend the
23
     terms and he runs those terms, I think that would be very
24
    helpful.
25
               THE COURT: Give him today --
```

```
7
 1
               MR. FARR: We will.
 2
               THE COURT: -- the definitive aggregated list of the
 3
     search terms.
 4
               MR. FARR: Very well, Your Honor. Thank you.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. All right.
 6
               MR. KOVALICK: Thank you, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: The motion is granted.
               MS. COSTIN: Your Honor, can I have a one
 8
 9
     housekeeping term, totally unrelated to them?
10
               THE COURT: All right.
11
               MS. COSTIN: It involves the pretrial conference
12
     that's set for September 25. Would we had the continued
13
     rescheduling conference in July, Your Honor had expressed the
14
     fact that at the pretrial conference we may only be discussing
15
     a trial date and may not be exchanging a list of witnesses and
16
     exhibits. But there was never an order discussing that.
17
               Will we be exchanging witnesses and --
18
               THE COURT: No. And I didn't think I needed an
     order. Just tell Judge Ellis that I told you that under the
19
20
     circumstances you didn't need to do the usual submissions at
     that time.
21
22
               But by way of additional clarification, by that time
23
     I would expect everything to be sufficiently close to wind-up
24
     so you all could agree on an orderly schedule based on the
25
     trial date in which you could get all of that taken care of on
```